

EUROPAE (ALE)

sous la rédaction de

Mario Alinei, président;

A. Weijnen, ancien-président;

Terho Itkonen et Mieczysław Szymczak†, vice-présidents;

Jacques Allières, Manuel Alvar, Nils Arhammar, Manuela Barros Ferreira,

Dalibor Brozović, Boris Cazacu, David Clement, Nicolas Contossopoulos,

Manlio Cortelazzo, László Deme, Inger Ejkskjær, Lennart Elmevik, T. V.

Gamkrelidze, Jan Goossens, Corrado Grassi, Rudolf Grosse, A. Hagen, Eric

Hamp, Reiner Hildebrandt, V. V. Ivanov, Pavle Ivić, G. A. Klimov, Jorma

Koivulehto, F. Kortlandt, A. Kostallari, Jean Le Dû, Wolfgang Putschke,

Ernest Schüle, B.A. Serebrennikov, E. R. Tenišev, Gaston Tuaillon, J.D.A.

Widdowson et Werner Winter.

Secrétariat:

central: J. Kruijsen (coordination), N. van der Sijs (rédaction);

des départements: Y. Le Berre, N.Z. Donadze, H. Franconie, J. Kruijsen,

L. Sarvas;

du bureau de cartographie automatique: R. Neumann.

VOLUME I – COMMENTAIRES

deuxième fascicule

par

Mario Alinei, Rita Caprini, B. Kálmán, Joep Kruijsen, Ellen Mooijman,

J. Petr, Mieczysław Szymczak e.a., A. Weijnen.

sous les auspices de l'UNESCO



VAN GORCUM, ASSEN/MAASTRICHT, PAYS-BAS, 1986

Tous droits réservés

No parts of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm or any other means without written permission from the publisher.

CIP-GEGEVENS KONINKLIJKE BIBLIOTHEEK, DEN HAAG

Atlas

Atlas linguarum Europae (ALE) / sous la dir. de Mario Alinei . . . [et al.]. — Assen [etc.]: Van Gorcum Vol. I: Commentaires, deuxième fascicule / par Mario Alinei . . . [et al.]

11 kaarten (in map)

Tekst in Engels, Duits en Frans.

Uitg. onder auspiciën van de UNESCO.

Met reg.

SISO 801.1 UDC 802

Trefw.: taalkunde ; Europa.

ISBN 90-232-2103-6

Cette publication a été préparée

- avec le concours financier de l'UNESCO, sur la recommandation du Comité International Permanent des Linguistes (CIPL) et sous les auspices du Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines (CIPSH);
- sous les auspices de l'Union Académique Internationale;
- avec le soutien financier de l'Organisation Néerlandaise pour le Développement de la Recherche Scientifique (ZWO);
- avec le soutien financier de la Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), sur la recommandation du Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache, Deutscher Sprachatlas de Marburg.
- avec le soutien financier de l'Académie Royale Néerlandaise des Sciences et des Arts.

La couverture représente la première carte linguistique européenne. Elle a été dessinée par le Hollandais Lambert ten Kate Hermansz, et publiée en 1723 à Amsterdam, dans: *Aenleiding tot de Kennisse van het Verhevene Deel der Nederduitsche Sprake, waarin hare zekerste Grondslag, edelste Kraght, nuttelijkste Onderscheiding en geregeldste Afleiding overwogen en naegespoort, en tegen het Allervoornaemste der Verouderde en Nog-levende Taelverwanten, als 't Oude Moeso-Gotthisch, Frank-Duitsch en Angel-Saxisch beneffens het Hedendaegsche Hoog-Duitsch en Yslandsch vergeleken word, door Lambert ten Kate Hermansz., Amsterdam, Rudolf en Gerard Wetstein, 1723.*

Imprimé par Van Gorcum, Assen

Printed in The Netherlands by Van Gorcum, Assen

COMITÉS NATIONAUX DE L'ALE

Albanie

A. Kostallari (prés.)

E. Çabej †

M. Domi (vice-prés.)

L. Dodbiba†

J. Gjinari (secr.)

A. Dodí

B. Beci

J. Thomaj

Autriche

P. Wiesinger

Belgique-Wallon

(Commission Royale de Toponymie et de Dialectologie, section wallonne)

A. Arnould

L. Léonard

W. Bal

R. Mantou

A. Boileau

J. M. Pierret

A. Goosse

M. Piron

J. Herbillon

L. Remacle

O. Jodogne

P. Ruelle

J. Lechanteur

L. Warnant

Belgique-Flamand

(Koninklijke Commissie voor Toponymie en Dialectologie, Vlaamse afd.)

J. Goossens (prés.)

K. Roelandts

F. Debrabandere

A. Stevens

M. Gysseling

J. Taeldeman

J. Helsen

C. Tavernier-Vereecken

M. Hoebeke

V. F. Vanacker

A. van Loey

R. Vanpassen

J. Molemans

R. Willemyns

J. Moors

Bulgarie

Le Comité Bulgare s'est retiré de l'ALE, voir fasc. p. XXXIX.

Chypre

C. P. Kyrris (prés.)

I. Theocharides

M. Christodoulou

<i>Danemark</i>	P. Andersen (prés.) † J. Asmussen I. Ejskjær	K. Ringgaard H. Spang-Hanssen
<i>Espagne</i>	M. Alvar (prés.) E. Alarcos A. Badía T. Buesa	C. García A. Llorente L. Michelena J. Veny
<i>Finlande-finnois</i>	T. Itkonen (prés.) L. Sarvas (secr.) O. Ikola J. Koivulehto P. Lehtimäki	T. Lehtinen H. Leskinen H. Paunonen P. Sammallahti P. Virtaranta
<i>Finlande-suédois</i>	C.-E. Thors du Comité suédois	
<i>France</i>	G. Tuaillon (prés.) H. Franconie M.-J. Dalbera (pour le corse) J. Le Dû (pour le breton) M. Philipp (pour les parlers germaniques d'Alsace et de Moselle) J. Allières (pour le basque)	J. E. Médélice R. Stiers
<i>Frison aux Pays-Bas et dans la R.F.A.</i>	N. Århammar	
<i>G. B. Angleterre et P. de Galles, anglais</i>	M. F. Wakelin (prés.) P. Duncan M. Durrell S. Ellis C. Heath J. Levitt G. Nixon D. Parry	F. C. Stork A. Thomas P. Trudgill Cl. Upton J. C. Wells J. D. A. Widdowson P. Wright
<i>G. B. Écosse</i>	H. Speitel (Écosse anglophone) D. Clement (Écosse gaélique) C. R. Shuken	

<i>G. B. Irlande du Nord</i>	M. Barry
<i>G. B. Île de Man</i>	G. Broderick

<i>G. B. Pays de Galles, celtique</i>	A. Thomas P.W. Thomas
---------------------------------------	--------------------------

<i>Grèce</i>	(Centre de Rédaction du Dictionnaire historique du grec moderne, langue commune et dialectes, de l'Académie d'Athènes) Responsable pour l'ALE N. Contossopoulos
--------------	---

<i>Hongrie</i>	S. Imre (prés.) L. Balogh (secr.) L. Benkő L. Deme M. Hutterer	B. Kálmán P. Király A. Nyíri Á. Sebestyén M. Temesi
----------------	--	---

<i>Iles Féroé</i>	J. H. W. Poulsen
-------------------	------------------

<i>Irlande, celtique</i>	J. Watson
--------------------------	-----------

<i>Irlande, anglais</i>	P. Henry
-------------------------	----------

<i>Islande</i>	(Comité ad hoc formé par un groupe de linguistes néerlandais: P. Vermeyden et A. Key) Conseiller spécial: J. A. Jónsson
----------------	--

<i>Italie</i>	M. Cortelazzo (prés.) A. Genre (secr.) S. Canobbio M. Contini C. Marcato	L. Massobrio O. Profili T. Telmon M. T. Vigolo
---------------	--	---

<i>Lapon en Norvège, Suède, Finlande et URSS</i>	L.-G. Larsson H. Rydving
--	-----------------------------

<i>Luxembourg</i>	A. Atten
-------------------	----------

<i>Malte</i>	J. Aquilina (prés.) J. Cardona J. Cassar Pullicino	E. Fenech M. R. Gatt E. Mifsud
<i>Norvège</i>	I. Hoff (prés.) O. Beito K. Bergsland A. Bjørkum A. Borg A. Dalen R. Djupedal	K. Elstad T. Frette I. Frøyset † G. Rundhovde J. A. Schulze J. Øverby
<i>Pays-Bas</i>	H. Brok (prés.) J. Berns J. Daan H. Entjes M. Gerritsen A. Goeman P. Goossens	H. Hogerheijde G. Kocks E. Mooijman J. de Rooij A. Schaars K. van der Veen J. Vromans
<i>Pologne</i>	(Comité de Dialectologie de l'Académie des Sciences Polonaise) K. Dejna (prés.) J. Basara (secr.) J. Reichan J. Siatkowski groupe de travail du Zakład Językoznawstwa IJP PAN: M. Szymczak (prés.) † H. Zduńska (secr.) A. Basara J. Basara	
		M. Szymczak † H. Taborska S. Urbańczyk A. Zaręba B. Falińska M. Mucowa N. Perczyńska J. Sułkowska
<i>Portugal</i>	(Grupo de Estudos de Dialectologia da Universidade de Lisboa) M. Barros Ferreira C. Lopes Augusto	
	J. Saramago M. G. Vitorino	
<i>RDA</i>	R. Grosse (prés.) G. Bergmann H. Faszke J. Gundlach R. Herrmann	G. Ising † S. Michalk H. Schönfeld K. Spangenberg

<i>RFA</i>	R. Hildebrandt (prés.) G. W. Baur H. Beck G. Bellmann W. Besch E. Bremer W. Hoffmann W. Kleiber	W. König K. J. Mattheier H. Niebaum E. Seidelmann H. Steger H. Taubken E. Wagner
<i>Roumanie</i>	I. Coteanu (prés.) B. Cazacu (vice-prés.) I. Pătruț (vice-prés.) N. Saramandu (secr.) V. Arvinte E. Beltechi St. Binder S. Dumitrăcel I. Faiciuc	L. Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu Gh. Mihăilă N. Mocanu L. Murădin P. Neiescu I. Stan T. Teaha D. Urițescu E. Vasiliu
<i>Suède</i>	L. Elmevik (prés.) E. O. Bergfors (vice- prés.) L. Bleckert (secr.) S. Benson K.-H. Dahlstedt Å. Hansson	H. Karlsson L.-G. Larsson B. Pamp V. Reinhammar C.-E. Thors B. Wickman
<i>Suisse</i>	E. Schüle (prés.) A. Decurtins Z. Marzys	F. Spiess R. Trüb
<i>Tchécoslovaquie</i>	J. Petr (prés.) P. Jančák (secr.) J. Horecký A. Lamprecht	Š. Ondruš I. Ripka S. Utěšený A. Erhart (consultant)
<i>Turquie</i>	N. Yüce	
<i>Langues Tziganes</i>	(International Committee for Romani) D. Kenrick (secr.)	

URSS

V. V. Ivanov (prés.)	A. A. Krivickij
N. Z. Donadze (secr.)	P. N. Lizanec
Š. H. Akbaev	L. T. Mahmutova
G. G. Baraksanov	N. H. Maksjutova
M. Ja. Barmič	K. F. Morkunas
R. M. Batalova	R. Š. Nasibullin
A. Ja. Blinkena	H. J. Neetar
D. V. Cygankin	B. A. Serebrennikov
S. M. Džamirzaev	L. P. Sergeev
G. A. Gajdarži	N. T. Tabulova
T. V. Gamkrelidze	B. B. Talibov
N. T. Gišev	R. H. Temirova
N. I. Isanbaev	E. R. Tenišev
S. A. Kalmykova	H. A. Tokazov
G. M. Kert	N. N. Ubušev
G. A. Klimov	R. Ja. Udler
D. N. Klyčev	

Yougoslavie

P. Ivić (prés.)	M. Lončarić
S. Remetić (secr.)	M. Menac
F. Benedik	L. Mulaku
D. Brozović	A. Peco
D. Čupić	K. Peev
B. Finka	O. Penavin
R. Flora	D. Petrović
S. Horvat	J. Rigler
O. Jašar-Nasteva	A. Šojat
J. Lisac	B. Vidoeski
T. Logar	D. Vujičić

DÉPARTEMENTS DES GROUPES DE LANGUES

Les Départements des groupes de langues sont constitués par les membres de la Rédaction et des Comités Nationaux spécialistes en la matière. La direction des Départements est assurée par:

1. LANGUES CELTIQUES: J. Le Dù (prés.), D. Clement (vice-prés.), Y. Le Berre (secr.)
2. LANGUES ROMANES: G. Tuaillon (prés.), H. Franconie (secr.)
3. LANGUES GERMANIQUES: N. Århammar (prés.), J. Kruijsen (secr.)
4. LANGUES BALTES ET SLAVES: V. V. Ivanov et P. Ivić (prés.), N. Z. Donadze (secr.)
5. LANGUES OURALIQUES: T. Itkonen et B. A. Serebrennikov (prés.), L. Sarvas (secr. provisoire)
6. AUTRES LANGUES DE L'OUEST: J. Allières (prés.)
7. AUTRES LANGUES DE L'EST: G. A. Klimov et E. R. Tenišev (prés.), N. Z. Donadze (secr.)

COMMISSION INDO-EUROPÉENNE

W. Winter (prés.)
 M. Mayrhofer (vice-prés.)
 T. V. Gamkrelidze
 E. Hamp
 J. Koivulehto
 F. Kortlandt
 E. Polomé

COMITÉ DE COORDINATION

M. Alinei (prés. de la Rédaction);
 J. Allières, N. Århammar, T. Itkonen, V. V. Ivanov, P. Ivić, G. A. Klimov, J. Le Dù, B. A. Serebrennikov, E. R. Tenišev, G. Tuaillon (prés. des Départements);
 W. Winter (prés. de la Commission Indo-Européenne);
 W. Putschke (dir. du Bureau de Cartographie Automatique);
 D. Brozović, B. Cazacu, L. Deme, M. Szymczak†, A. Weijnen (membres).

COMITÉ DE PATRONAGE

C. Battisti†	A. N. Kononov
V. I. Borkovskij†	W. Mitzka†
M. Cohen†	Chr. Mohrmann
P. Gardette†	W. Moulton
Vl. Georgiev	H. Orton†
B. Havránek†	G. Rohlf
R. Jakobson†	Al. Rosetti
V. Jansson	A.-J. van Windekens

TABLE DES MATIÈRES

<i>Comités Nationaux</i>	v
<i>Départements des Groupes de Langues et Commission Indo-Européenne</i>	x
<i>Comité de Coordination</i>	x
<i>Comité de Patronage</i>	xi
<i>Table des Matières</i>	xii
<i>Questions publiées dans ALE I 1 et ALE I 2</i>	xv
<i>Introduction par Mario Alinei</i>	xvi
<i>Abréviations</i>	xxxv
<i>Aperçus généraux:</i>	
<i>A. Réseaux des points énumérés dans l'ordre des unités de recherche</i>	l
<i>B. Langues ou dialectes regroupés suivant les Départements</i>	lv
<i>C. Pays par ordre alphabétique</i>	lx
<i>Réseau des points d'enquête</i>	lxvi
<i>Notation phonétique</i>	ic
<i>Translittérations des alphabets non-latins:</i>	
1. <i>Translittérations des alphabets cyrilliques</i>	cii
2. <i>Translittération de l'alphabet grec</i>	cx
3. <i>Translittération de l'alphabet arabe classique</i>	cx
 <i>Commentaires</i>	
I carte I.20, <i>Chandelle de Glace</i> (QI:21), par J. Petr	1
II carte I.21, <i>Fleur</i> (QI:35), par A. Weijnen	4
III carte I.22 et I.23, <i>Branche</i> (QI:43-44), par A. Weijnen et Joep Kruijsen	5
IV carte I.24, <i>Bouleau</i> (QI:55), par le Groupe de recherche du Zakład Językoznawstwa IJP PAN à Varsovie sous la direction de M. Szymczak	8
V carte I.25, <i>Peuplier</i> (QI:56), par Rita Caprini	9
VI carte I.26, <i>Poire</i> (QI:59), par B. Kálmán	11
VII carte I.27, <i>Genévrier</i> (QI:61), par Ellen Mooijman	12
VIII carte I.28, <i>Belette</i> (QI:101), par Mario Alinei	14
 <i>Bibliographie générale</i>	22

INTRODUCTION

by Mario Alinei

I. The second issue of ALE I appears a little more than two years after the publication of ALE I 1¹. For a project of the size of the ALE, two years might not seem a great lapse of time, especially comparing it to similar projects: the *Atlante Linguistico Mediterraneo*, after publishing its essay fascicle in 1971, is now, fifteen years later, preparing its first (raw-data) volume.

Nevertheless, publication of this issue could have taken place earlier, so a justification of this delay may be useful. Essentially, the publication of this issue has been delayed by: (i) Changes in the ALE net, which made it necessary to reprint the basic map; (ii) Other changes in the data system, which involved a thorough revision of the introductory part of this volume; (iii) Changes in the ALE organization, aiming at improving the quality of the contributions; (iv) Bottle-necks caused by the present size of the central staff (two half-time workers!); (v) Technical reorganization of our publishers. In my description of this issue, and of its differences in comparison with the first one, I will return to some of these points.

II. Evaluation of ALE I 1. To my knowledge the following review -articles have appeared in scientific journals²: by Alpo Räsänen (1985), by S. Semčyns'kyj (1985), and by Zuzanna Topolińska (1985). While thanking our first reviewers, I would like to explain that these reviews appeared when this issue had already been set in print, so we will be able to benefit from their remarks only in the following issues. My discussion of these reviews has a threefold goal: (i) to illustrate what has been considered positive by our reviewers, and therefore should be continued and developed by us; (ii) to illustrate what has been criticized, in the hope that this issue will prove we have already made some progress in eliminating some of our shortcomings; (iii) to underline what remains to be done to improve our work.

¹ The first issue appeared in March 1984, with the date of 1983.

² I do not take into consideration short notices, and reviews published in the non-specialized press. Information about the reviews by Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu (*Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, XXIX (1984), pp. 549-553), and by Nicolae Saramandu (*Studii și cercetări lingvistice*, XXXVI (1985), pp. 326-329) has reached us too late.

At the outset of her theory-oriented review the distinguished Polish linguist Zuzanna Topolińska writes: "the publication of the ALE is a much greater event in the history of linguo-geographical research than in the history of the Indo-European, Altaic, Basque, etc. linguistics" (373). In my opinion, this is a particularly welcome definition of the essence of our project. Although there are important areas where a geographical presentation of interpreted data takes place for the first time in the ALE, it is obvious — from a theoretical point of view — that a part cannot make the whole. The structure, and the *Gestalt* itself of the ALE — in a technical sense — are by definition that of an interlingual project, and therefore, in the logical hierarchy of the project, interlingual features are ranked higher than infralinguistic ones. For the largest part of Europe, a higher level of knowledge of specific language areas can only be reached by means of departmental atlases (of the OLA type), or by innovative atlases relevant to specific areas. Professor Topolińska's following claim, therefore, poses an interesting problem: "...the ALE... is not a project of comparative linguistics...; it is rather a study in the typology of linguistic evolution aimed at the reconstruction of the cultural rather than of the linguistic differentiation and stratification of the European territory" (374). In my opinion, this is basically a correct statement. One could perhaps add that in the ALE comparative (infra)linguistics is by definition necessary, but plays a less important role than interlinguistic comparison. In the ALE, in other words, infralinguistics and interlinguistics are in a taxonomic relationship with each other, rather than in a relationship of opposition. Coming to a closer analysis of the ALE, the reviewer recognizes and emphasises "two different treatments of the linguistic data" as the main feature of the project: onomasiological and motivational. In discussing the onomasiological treatment Professor Topolińska poses a very important question about "the identity of the object". She wonders, for example, whether some of the questions treated in the first issue should have been treated at all, given their inherent ambiguity, and the visible impact of such ambiguity on relevant maps and commentaries. This is a question that has received too little attention from us, and which will have to be studied in the framework of our plans for future publications. After a perceptive definition of the essence of a motivational map and commentary ("a study in the field of diachronic lexical semantics; ... a culturological study revealing the cultural stratigraphy of the names in question; ... a treatment which is optimally adapted to ALE materials, i.e. most suitable as a way of presenting the crucial information contained by these materials": 375), the reviewer comes to what she calls "the central problem of the ALE: the interdependence and the mutual hierarchy of the maps and the commentaries" (375). Her analysis of the relevant ALE features, as appearing in the first issue, leads her to the following conclusion, in my opinion of great importance for a correct evaluation of the ALE as a scientific

project: "the ALE *should* (italics mine) consist of a series of monographical studies in lexical semantics, more or less successfully illustrated with maps. The studies (= commentaries) should contain basic, authorized information, whereas the so called 'onomasiological' maps are only a way of preliminary ordering the materials" (376). Hence her criticism: "The commentaries of the ALE oscillate between two patterns: (A) a thorough interpretive study embracing exhaustive motivational and etymothetical analyses vs. (B) a concise etymographic inventory devoid of deeper authorized interpretation. The two patterns correspond to two totally different conceptions of the whole enterprise" (*ibid.*). In other words: "Pattern A ... results in a monographic contribution of great importance to our knowledge of European culture. Pattern (B) ... results in an unfinished product leaving further interpretive analysis to the addressee" (376). The goal of the ALE, however, on the basis of my own *Introduction* to the first issue (ALE I 1-INTR.), seems to the reviewer to be pattern (A). Consequently, she concludes: "the commentaries should be unified and the interpretation levelled". More sharply, the same conclusion is expressed at the end of the review, where "a stricter selection of the maps and a more levelled treatment of the input data" are presented as the most important improvements to be introduced into the policy of the ALE, as reflected in its first issue. What seems to me most important in this lucid and stimulating review is the identification of two main oppositions underlying the ALE: (A) onomasiological vs. motivational treatment and (B) (in her terms) "finished" vs. "unfinished" product. The first is a methodological, structural opposition, the second an individual choice made by the authors. By cross-classifying our potential output according to this double oppositional pair we would therefore generate four different treatments: (i) onomasiological unfinished (ii) onomasiological finished; (iii) motivational unfinished (iv) motivational finished. Assuming however, with the reviewer, that motivational treatment is by definition a finished product, then we are left with three possible tracks: (i) the motivational, finished product; (ii) the onomasiological finished product, and (iii) the onomasiological unfinished product. The fact that the reviewer classifies some onomasiological treatments of the first issues among the "monographic" contributions (376), confirms my conclusion. Professor Topolińska's critical advice could therefore be summarized as follows: increase the level of onomasiological treatments, so much as to eliminate altogether the opposition between "finished" vs. "unfinished". Then we would only have the opposition between onomasiological and motivational treatment, but the level would be "finished". I am happy to say that in essence, this is exactly what I think we have tried to do in this second issue. Our primary task has been (and I hope will remain) that of raising the level of our contributions. Our recent efforts to select questions suitable to a pan-European treatment, the decision taken in Aussois (1984) to choose for "quality"

rather than "quality", and that taken in Belgrade (1985) to eliminate the so-called "list-like" commentaries (as described in ALE I 1-INTR., p. XXX) all confirm our awareness of the problem. At the same time, however, I wonder whether this goal can be more than an ideal. Even monumental works such as the ten volumes of the HwDA, or, closer to our field, the unparalleled dictionaries of the four languages of Switzerland (the SI, DRG, GPSR and VSI, which, rather than "dictionaries" should be called "encyclopaedias of dialects, material culture and folklore") cannot help showing an unequal treatment of materials. This is inevitable, owing to both objective and subjective differences, i.e. differences in the materials, which can be more or less interesting and suitable for treatment, and in individual approaches. The point, in any monumental work, is not to reach a uniform *top* level, but rather to show where that top level can be placed in a particular moment of the history of a discipline, and to offer it as a dynamic frontier for anyone to improve or to elaborate.

In his review, the Ukrainian linguist S. Semčyns'kyj, while accepting the definition of the ALE as an atlas of the "fourth generation" (75), aptly adds that for certain areas, where no national atlases existed, the ALE at the same time belongs to the "first generation" (78). Like the preceding reviewer, he stresses the importance of motivational treatment: he believes it opens new prospects in geolinguistics, and he finds it important for semantic theory and for the theory of naming (76). Correctly, he attributes to geolinguistics the merit of having proved the universal character of motivations. In his opinion, the 5 motivational maps published in ALE I 1 permit us to foresee a great future for this kind of investigation (76). Motivational research is also seen as a contribution to the solution of the complicated problem of the reconstruction of the cultural prehistory of Europe (77). While underlining the importance that the pre-existence of the OLA has had for the realization of the ALE (75), he sees the ALE as a project that opens the way to a "fifth generation" of language atlases, that of intercontinental surveys (78). Quite correctly, he sees the main problem of the ALE in the complications deriving from three factors: (i) the largeness of the area; (ii) the difference in the density of the net in different sub-areas; (iii) the heterogeneity of the sources. His critical remarks are numerous and important. It will not surprise the ALE Editorial Board to hear that we have not yet reached sufficient clearness about the criteria governing the mapping of materials in onomasiological maps (75); more precisely that in onomasiological maps symbols can have quite different values (77). He criticizes the transliteration of the Ukr. grapheme *г* with *g*, instead of *h* (77). He notes inconsequent and unjustified statements in commentaries, and disturbing misprints not only in the list of net-points, but especially in the materials and in commentaries. As to this last point, we hope

this second issue will show an improvement, despite the inadequacy of our present forces.

The Finnish linguist Alpo Räisänen also gives an essentially positive evaluation of the first issue of ALE I. Like the other two reviewers, he stresses the importance of the motivational treatment, which, according to him, reaches a higher level of historical knowledge. He states that the ALE cannot be considered only a collection of acquired data, but should also be regarded as the starting point for new hypotheses and research. His critical remarks concern on the one hand the vulnerability of the gigantic structure of the ALE, owing to which the failing of one National Committee causes the whole enterprise to suffer; the difficulties in recognizing some 200 symbols on one map (here I would like to comment that well chosen symbols can be much more numerous than less aptly chosen ones); on the other, like Semčyns'kyj, he notes the difference in criteria for the onomasiological treatment, and — like Topolińska — the unsuitability of certain questions, too dependent on geographic circumstances, for a pan-European treatment. After a positive evaluation of my own treatment of "arc-en-ciel" he compares the ALE's reader, in a charming image, to a catpillar climbing a rainbow: he will have before him beautiful views, a part of which opens itself immediately, but to see the rest he will have to do much time-consuming work: where the opposition is basically the same as the one commented upon by Professor Topolińska.

Summarizing the main points of these reviews, we will obviously distinguish between a positive and a negative side:

(A) As far as the positive side is concerned:

- (i) The motivational treatment has been considered highly positive by all reviewers and, what I find most important, both on the level of theory and on the level of results. In the light of this evaluation, we can only be pleased that this second issue has more motivational maps than the first, comparatively speaking, and we ought to try to further develop, in quality and in quantity, this innovative line of research that has been presented for the first time within the ALE.
- (ii) To the positive side belongs also the formulation "monographic contribution of great importance in our knowledge of European culture" used by Professor Topolińska for both motivational and onomasiological contributions.
- (iii) The positive evaluation of our plan to publish our archives. I will return to this point in a separate section.

(B) As far as the negative side is concerned, here is a list of the weaknesses pointed out to us by the reviewers:

- (i) Errors in the phonetic transcription and in the transliteration systems.
- (ii) Misprints, especially annoying in legends and commentaries.

(iii) Excessive number of symbols on one map (especially noticeable if the symbols are not well chosen).

(iv) Diversity of criteria in the onomasiological treatment.

(v) Unsuitable questions for mapping.

(vi) "Unfinished" character of some onomasiological treatments (to which belong inconsequent and/or unjustified statements).

None of these problems is new to us. We can only promise we will renew our efforts to solve them, or at least to make them less serious.

In ALE I 1-INTR., I had expressed the hope that the ALE may be an inspiring force for the filling of the most important gap in the present state of geolinguistics: that of the (interpretative) atlases of the "third generation", i.e. the language-group atlases, until now only represented by the yet unpublished OLA. I claimed that a project should not only be judged on the basis of the results it reaches (though these will always remain its primary goal) but also of the research it can stimulate and inspire. Therefore, I am very glad to be able to announce — on behalf of our friends and colleagues of the Romance Department — that the first preparations for a Romance Language Atlas have been started. This news is not only welcome for the fact that such an atlas will be of great importance to our knowledge of Romance dialects and languages; but also (and this is why I include this announcement in the "evaluative" section of this *Introduction*) for the role the ALE has played as the inspiring force behind it, since the new project develops out of the new journal *Géolinguistique*, initiated by the Centre de Dialectologie de Grenoble, headquarters of our Romance Department. Perhaps this is a good opportunity to express the hope that the same initiative will be taken by other ALE Departments.

III. Differences between ALE I 2 and ALE I 1. Before comparing this second issue with the first, I would like to refer the reader to my ALE I 1-INTR.: in the following sections I will only dwell on those parts that differ from the corresponding parts of the first issue.

Much work has been done to improve the quality of the contributions. One of the limitations that we have been able to eliminate radically was that of the number of pages for each commentary. The first issue presented this limitation, as a consequence of the original plan to print commentaries on the back of the maps (cp. ALE I 1-INTR. p. XXVII). Longer commentaries, and even extra-long ones (such as that for "chandelle de glace" and for "belette") have become possible, and should be seen as an attempt to raise the top level of the project, in the light of what I said above.

An important difference between the first and the present issue lies in the relationship between motivational and onomasiological treatment of questions. If the ratio in the first issue was 2:12, in this issue it has become 3:6. I hope this can be taken as a sign that the new methodology is gaining ground

among ALE's authors. Interesting motivational treatments are in preparation for the next issues. Not all questions, however, in fact perhaps only a few, are suitable for a motivational treatment. In this issue, the question "branche" has been treated both onomasiologically and motivationally. Comparison of the two maps will permit the verification of Professor Topolińska's thesis, i.e. that an onomasiological map represents a preliminary ordering of the materials. This thesis, however, can be interpreted in two different ways: in a formal, and in a substantial sense. In a formal sense, given an onomasiological map, and on strict condition that the motivations of the different onomasiological areas are adequately defined, it should always be possible to construct a motivational map by neutralizing the formal differences between the etyma, leaving motivations as the only objects for mapping. Naturally, the main problem here is that of an adequate definition of *motivation*, which should be the subject of further theoretical investigation³. In a substantial sense, a motivational map would make "its" preliminary onomasiological map superfluous. Comparison of the two maps for "branche" will be useful for this discussion, although a *prise de position* on this issue will ultimately depend on the general assumptions one makes about the goals of an interlinguistic atlas.

Questions concerning Indo-European connections have been studied by the newly installed IE. Commission, composed of the distinguished linguists W. Winter (president), M. Mayrhofer (vice-pres.), T.V. Gamkrelidze, E. Hamp, J. Koivulehto, F. Kortlandt and E. Polomé. The quantity and quality of remarks received by the new IE. Commission have been impressive.

Due to the unsatisfactory results obtained through the previous organization, the already existing Coordinating Committee (whose members represent the main language-areas of the ALE) has been utilized as an evaluating organ. The results of this change have met the expectations, since a mass of remarks, suggestions and corrections has — via the central organs — reached the authors. In spite of this new important support, however, too much pre-editing and post-editing work has still fallen on the shoulders of the President. Hence the decision taken in Belgrade (1985) to eliminate central pre-editing and post-editing of contributions altogether.

Much time has also been invested in streamlining and uniforming the contributions, within the limitations posed by the authors' different approaches.

Substantial improvements in the quality of contributions, as those described so far, are necessarily time-consuming. We hope that a stringent implementation of the decisions taken in Belgrade will contribute to reducing this price to a minimum.

In the commentary volume, the Bibliography of each contribution has been

³ The theoretical study of *motivation* (i.e. of its role in the structure of meaning) has been very much neglected. See for the moment Alinei (1979, 1980).

split into two parts: a *Bibliographie générale*, which includes only atlases, dictionaries and ALE basic literature; and a *Bibliographie spécifique*, which includes what is relevant to the subject of the contribution. The distinction also applies to this *Introduction*.

The great complexity of some legends of the first issue has proved to be a problem when it is necessary to compare the legend with the map. Hence the decision to print maps and legends on separate sheets, and to leave them unbound.

I shall add a few clarifying remarks:

- (i) The term *unica*, often used in legends and in commentaries, refers to the concept of "geographic hapax", defined in ALE I 1-INTR. (p. XXIX) as "an item that is isolated not only etymologically, but also geographically".
- (ii) For "lexical hapax legomena" (items without etymological connections on the map, but present in more than one point: cp. ALE I 1-INTR., *ibid.*), one single letter has been used in this issue instead of two.
- (iii) The symbol ← has been adopted in legends and lists to indicate "borrowed from".
- (iv) In legends, the decimal-classification system has been used in a less uniform way than my previous *Introduction* could have led to think. In this issue, both the number and the value of the levels can vary, depending on the materials and on the author.

IV. Changes in the net. The following improvements of the national nets have been realised:

The Italian net has been more than doubled, and has acquired the same structural character as the French net. Instead of the 77 points of the previous net, the Italian net now comprehends 176 points, each of which corresponds to one or more AIS points. For each question all AIS materials will therefore be processed, in order to give a representative picture of the richness of the Italian dialects.

6 Welsh points have been added, replacing as many previously English ones.

The Irish net has been increased from 7 to 9 points.

The Gaelic net has been increased from 10 to 14 points.

2 Points have been introduced for the (Turkic) Gagauz in the Moldavian SSR as part of the research unit 28.9.

The Serbo-Croatian net has been increased by 1 point.

The Turkish net for the island of Cyprus has been eliminated, and with it the research unit 30.1.

A few points have been eliminated (viz. 3 points from the Austrian net, 1 from the Norwegian net and 2 Lappish and 2 Finnish points from the Swedish net), after the respective National Committees had decided not to do any

field-work there. As a consequence, some numbers are missing in the respective lists of net-points.

The complete list of the net-points is presented on pp. LXVII-XCVII (see also below).

In the present issue, only the map and the commentary "belette" cover the whole new net, while the other contributions are still based on the old one. The new net-points, in the other maps, have received the code for "no answer", while the actual status of the new points is that "no question" was asked there. The missing materials of ALE I 1-2 will hopefully be published in a *Supplement*.

V. Changes in the basic map (ALE I A). Owing to the above-listed changes in the ALE net, the basic map has been reprinted with the new net. It has been given a different number (I A), to distinguish it from the previous, now obsolete edition (I O).

For the reader's sake I repeat here that all net-points on the maps are indicated by numbers followed by one or more letters. The letters indicate the language-group or language-family to which each net-point belongs (see list on p. XXXV. The number preceding the letter(s) implicitly refers to the country: e.g. 91R in Italy means: point 91 (= 091) in the Italian net, belonging to the Romance area. 701A1, also in Italy, means: point 701 in the Italian net, belonging to the Albanian minority. 801G, also in Italy, means: belonging to the German minority.

The abbreviation Tz (Tzigane) for the 6 Romany points has been added on all maps.

In the geographic background of the basic map some corrections, concerning the rivers, have been made.

The coordinates of some Frisian points have also been modified.

My explanation of the distinction made by the Finnish Committee between "simple" and "complex" questions (ALE I 1-INTR., p. XXIV), has not been clear to some readers. A question is "simple" when the lexical differentiation of the answers is limited: e.g. (for Finnish) "cloud", "lake" etc., are bound to give only predictable variants of one lexical type. Conversely, a question is "complex" when the answers are phonetically unpredictable, or differentiated lexically and/or morphologically. Consequently, in the former case, the number of net-points can be kept low; in the latter, it will have to be high. This ingenious system could actually be recommended as a useful measure of simplification for every European area, since the opposition "simple" "complex" is universal, and often for the same *realia*.

VI. The linguistic membership of the ALE net-points (map I B). Experience with the basic map has taught us that the letters printed in the background,

though adequate for the identification of the linguistic membership of each point, do not give an overall picture of the European languages covered by the ALE net. Hence the idea of drawing a "language-family and language-group distribution map for the ALE net" in six different colours, representing the six language families: Altaic, Basque, Caucasian, Indo-European, Uralic and Semitic. Within the large coloured areas, different symbols differentiate the language groups belonging to each family. Needless to say, the map is especially useful for revealing the intricate and fascinating picture formed by the languages spoken in North-Eastern, Eastern and South-Eastern Europe, mostly in the USSR, and which form the gradual transition of Europe into Asia. Some of these languages appear in a geolinguistic presentation for the first time in history, and, in my opinion, can become the starting point for new projects, involving Central Asia, the Caucasus, Turkey, Iran.

Needless to say, this map does not aim at representing in any way the number of speakers, or the frequency of usage, of European languages and dialects, but simply at visually differentiating the linguistic membership of the ALE net-points.

VII. Changes in the phonetic transcription. The phonetic transcription system has been slightly modified and corrected on certain points. Owing to contradictory demands from different Departments and National Committees, however, the new system can not be considered definitive as yet.

VIII. Changes in the transliteration systems. On the advice of various National Committees, new transliteration systems have been added, and the previous ones have been changed, or more consequently applied. In particular:

A) The Cyrillic alphabet of Russian has been transliterated with only one system, and not with two (one for the materials and one for personal and place-names), as in the first issue.

B) The Greek transliteration has been improved.

C) A new transliteration system has been added:

(i) For several languages using a Cyrillic alphabet, other than Russian, both Slavic and non-Slavic;

(ii) For Classical Greek;

(iii) For Classical Arabic.

IX. Changes in the introductory surveys. A new manner of presenting the ALE different national or regional nets and their codes, the ALE languages and their groupings, and the countries participating in the project, has been devised. Three hierarchies of criteria have been used to classify the above listed data, i.e.:

A) A classification of the data according to the conventional, numerical code

of each research unit. Given a conventional code such as, for example, 16.0, this survey permits us to immediately trace this number in the numerical⁴ sequence, and to correlate it to the single net-point numbered 001⁴ of the Arabic research unit, abbreviated with the letters *Ar* on all maps, and corresponding to the island of Malta.

B) A classification of the data according to the new seven ALE language-departments (see below), corresponding to the major linguistic areas of Europe: (i) Celtic, (ii) Romance, (iii) Germanic, (iv) Balto-Slavic, (v) Uralic, (vi) Other languages of the West and (vii) Other languages of the East. In this list, it is for example possible to find which Uralic languages appear on the maps, and to find out that among them there is a Samoyed language, Nenets (formerly Yurak), in the USSR, whose net-points are marked on all maps with the abbreviation *Sa*, and whose complete coding is the following: 28.5/690-692. This general formula means: the conventional numeric code for the Nenets research unit is 28.5, its net-points are 690-692. By using the first list, one can see that the conventional code 28 corresponds to the USSR, and that there are ten research units in this country, from 28.0 for Russian, to 28.9 for Turkic and Mongolian.

C) A classification of the same data according to the alphabetic order of the names of the countries: here, for example, one can find under *France* that there are nine research units, i.e. Gallo-Roman, Catalan, Italian (Corse), Greek, Breton, Dutch, German and Basque; as well as which abbreviations and which net-points are to be found on the maps for each unit.

X. Changes in the presentation of the ALE net. The inventory of net-points is now arranged by country, in strict alphabetical order: the name of each country is followed, in brackets, by the corresponding language-group abbreviation, by the number of the ALE Language Department to which it belongs (e.g. *Autriche* (G.3) means Germanic, 3rd Department), and by the code number (e.g. 02.0). Under each title follows the list of the corresponding net-points. For the classification of the different languages spoken within the same political unit, different criteria have been used, which we have not yet been able to unify, despite decisions taken in Belgrade (1985)⁵. At present the criteria are the following four: (i) each language is presented with a separate title (e.g. *Espagne*: three different lists for Spanish, Catalan, Basque); (ii) each official language is given a separate list, and minorities are indicated where they occur in the net (e.g. in the list *Belgique, néerlandais*, the point 211 is

⁴ In the commentaries and maps, the zeroes have been neglected. We should have neglected them also in the introductory surveys. Unfortunately, when the mistake was discovered, the lists had already been set.

⁵ Corrections by Professor Winter were introduced in Belgrade, after the lists had already been printed.

German); (iii) each language is classified as a sub-group within the list of countries (e.g. *Roumanie*: a) Rumanian b) Hungarian c) German d) Serbo-Croatian e) Ukranian); (iv) all languages are indicated as they occur in the list (e.g. *Hongrie*: P.15 German, P.18 Slovak, P.35 Serbo-Croatian).

Inconsequences in the attribution of codes to alloglottal points (expressed by the numerous footnotes in the previous issue), have been eliminated.

XI. Changes in the abbreviation systems. The system of abbreviations has been entirely reshaped, owing to the many critical remarks we have received, concerning ambiguities and contradictions in the earlier version. From a theoretical viewpoint, however, the new system must also be considered provisory: in the present state of the art, a perfectly worked out system of French, English and German abbreviations, valid for all European languages, is not yet attainable. Abbreviations of languages and dialects are, needless to say, conventions resting upon criteria which are often undefined, and respect for existing traditions – however contradictory – should be one of the main criteria. On the other hand, such traditions are limited to specific language groups, within which they do not created interference problems. Besides, they can co-exist with a parallel tradition existing for the same language area but in a different language. So, for example, the French abbreviation system for Romance linguistics is different from the German abbreviation system for the same area, but both systems can co-exist, since they are in principle never used together. For the ALE we have two gigantic problems: (i) the simultaneous presence of three languages, i.e. French, English and German, for the same system; (ii) the simultaneous presence of different language areas, with ambiguities and contradictions resulting at two levels: within one language, and across different languages. This is why I think that the solution for these problems lies in – as is always the case for any important sign-system – an international agreement. As long as this agreement is not reached, we must regard extant traditions as provisory, or as valid only for a single field. And we must regard our solution as one of the many possible, until a definitive choice will be made with the “trademark” offered by international consensus.

The main criteria for the forming of the three systems have been the following:

A) Basically, abbreviations stop after the initial consonantal group: *Fr.* for French, *Gr.* for Greek etc., or after the first single consonant or consonantal group following a vowel or a syllable: *It.* for Italian, *And.* for Andi, *Balt.* for Baltic, *Russ.* for Russian etc. Wherever ambiguities with other languages would arise, the following consonant or consonantal group is reached: *Fris.* and *Frank.* for Frisian and Frankish, with *Fr.* for French as an exception owing to tradition and frequency.

B) Short names are not abbreviated, and thus have no period: *Lak*, *Rom* (vs.

Rom. for Romance, *Slovak* (vs. *Sl.* for Slavic and *Sloven.* for Slovenian), *Welsh*.

C) Abbreviations for compounds are formed in the same way, but without a period separating the two elements: *KomPerm.* for Komi-Permyak, *FrPr.* for Franco-Provençal, etc.

D) A separate list of general abbreviations, such as those for “Old” “Middle” “High” “Low” etc., has been compiled, to allow free combinations with the more specific abbreviations. In such cases, both abbreviations are followed by a period: *O.Fr.* “Old French”.

E) The main reasons for allowing exceptions to these rules have been:

(i) The existence of deeply rooted traditions: *Du.* for Dutch, *FU.* for Finno-Ugric, *IE.* for Indo-European, etc.

(ii) Ambiguities: e.g. given Finnish and Finnic (usually Baltic Finnic, in German: *ostseefinnisch*), *Finn.* has been adopted for Finnish, and *Fnc.* for Finnic.

(iii) Excessive length: *DaNorw.* has been preferred to *DanoNorw.*, etc.

Furthermore, the following innovations have been introduced:

F) Names of certain non-IE. languages of the USSR, in usage before the Revolution (and not yet abandoned outside the USSR), have been introduced in the lists, with a reference to the official Russian name: e.g. *Cheremis* see *Mari* (*Mar.*). For little-known languages of the USSR, for which sometimes there is not yet an established tradition in French, English or German naming, Russian names have been added, to permit verifications: e.g. *Fr. lak* (*Russ. lakskij*), *Engl. Lak*, *Germ. lakkisch*.

G) Geographic names without a linguistic content, such as *Austrian*, have not been included in the list of abbreviations. When used in a commentary, they have been spelled out.

XII. Changes in the organization. In the two years that separate the first two issues the Editorial Board of the ALE has lost two of its members: Professor Poul Andersen, senior member of our Board, representing Denmark from the very beginning of the official history of our project; and Professor Mieczysław Szymczak, vice-president of the ALE from 1983, representing Poland. They will be deeply missed.

The Editorial Board has co-opted some new members: professors Nils Århammar (Groningen), A. Hagen (Nijmegen), Eric Hamp (Chicago), Jean Le Dû (Brest), and H. Speitel (Edinburgh).

Prof. Jorma Koivulehto (Helsinki) was already appointed member of the Editorial Board in Leipzig (1983), but his name did not appear in the first issue owing to a mistake, for which I apologise.

Changes in the organization were decided upon in the two ALE meetings that took place during the last two years: at Aussois (1984) and Belgrade

(1985). Some of the decisions taken in Belgrade have not yet been implemented (see below).

The directions of organizational changes are basically the following two: (i) improvement of the quality of contributions and (ii) increase in the decentralization of the project. For the improvement of the quality I have already mentioned the *Indo-European Commission*, and the replacement of the many *Editorial Committees* by the already existing *Coordinating Committee*, which was therefore given an exclusively evaluating task (and should be called *Evaluating Committee* in the future). The Departmental structure has been modified: the *IE. Commission* has better specified its tasks, and acquired a status different from that of the Departments. The two Germanic Departments (Northern and Central) have been unified into a single *Germanic Department*. A *Celtic Department* and two '*Other-languages Departments*' (one for languages of the West, one for languages of the East) have been formed. All but one of the Departments now have a Secretariat. Some of the Department secretaries or representatives, after attending a *stage* organized in Marburg, have made a step towards a greater autonomy. The *Central secretariat* has been split into two functions, one mainly *coordinating*, one mainly *editorial*, with Drs. Joep Kruijsen fulfilling the first at the Catholic University of Nijmegen, and Drs. Nicoline van der Sijs the second, at the University of Utrecht. A *Departmental secretariat*, made up of the Secretaries of Departments, has been formed, in the hope that they may share the burden of the Central Secretariat. The already mentioned *stage* in Marburg has marked the official birth of this new organ, the functioning of which will be tested during the preparation of the next issue.

Other important changes were decided upon at the meeting of the Editorial Board in Belgrade (1985), and will be implemented for the publication of the next issues. They are the following: (i) The already-mentioned elimination of any central pre-editing and post-editing, which will alleviate the President's burden; (ii) The attribution of decisional power for the publication of the authors' contributions to a restricted number of Editors (i.e. a single, small *Editorial Committee*), supporting the President in this crucial phase of the project; (iii) A reorganization of the direction of the project, aiming at alleviating the President's task. This last plan, announced by the writer in Belgrade, will be discussed in the next meeting of the Editorial Board, at Edinburgh.

Summarizing the present organization, as will be implemented for the realization of the next issues: authors' contributions will first be submitted to the *Indo-European Commission* and to the large *Evaluating Committee*, whose remarks will be processed by the Centre and sent back to the authors. The final version of the contributions will then be evaluated for the final decision by an *Editorial Committee* chaired by the *President*. The new organization of

the direction will aim at a better distribution of organizational tasks, but will not modify this structure, as far as the publication of the project is concerned.

XIII. Publication of input data. Publication of input data, to which the ALE has committed itself after the DFG's criticism, has been realized only for motivational treatments, with the introduction of the so called *Répertoires classifiés* at the end of the commentaries on *motivational maps*⁶. It is interesting to note that the opposition between "finished" and "unfinished" coincides here with the basic difference in treatment, confirming Professor Topolińska's analysis.

As far as onomasiological maps are concerned, no progress on this point can be recorded, in spite of several concrete decisions (the last one in Belgrade (1985)). Even without considering our commitment towards the West-German DFG, and the encouraging judgement of the plan in Professor Topolińska's review, the publication of some forms of basic data is absolutely necessary, if the ALE wants to meet two basic requirements of any interpretative project: (i) a philological justification of one's work, and (ii) the possibility for the addressee to come to alternative interpretations. Obviously, the onomasiological legends can only offer a small fraction of the materials.

Two problems hinder the realization of this plan: (A) The original decision taken at the beginning of the ALE, contrary to the opinion of a minority of Editors, was against the publication of raw data. Owing to this original decision, National Committees were obviously left free to determine the manner of presenting the data: and since the ALE is an interpretative atlas, some National Committees, not without reasons, decided to present already interpreted, or standardized, materials. Input data, in other words, are heterogeneous. (B) Publishing raw data would duplicate the atlases in which raw data already appear. A solution must be sought in the publication of the basic data at a different level than that of the raw data.

XIV. Acknowledgements and thanks. It is my duty to once again thank, on behalf of the Editorial Board, the institutions that have been financing the ALE in the last two years, and the people who have helped us the most in realizing this issue.

To begin with, I would like to thank the UNESCO, in particular its Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines and its Comité International Permanent des Linguistes. I would like to repeat once more that the ALE would not exist, in its present form, without the model offered by UNESCO for international cooperation in science and culture.

A special word of thanks should be addressed to the institutions which have

⁶ With the exception of "branche", which was discovered too late.

supported the work of the ALE Presidency, and of the Central Secretariat: the UNESCO, the Dutch Academy of Sciences, the Catholic University of Nijmegen and the University of Utrecht.

For the computational realization of the maps of this issue we thank the West-German DFG, and the Abteilung Linguistische Informatik im Forschungsinstitut für deutsche Sprache of the Philipp University at Marburg. The same institutions should be thanked for the help given to the organization of the *stage* of Department Secretaries held at Marburg in 1985. Prof. W. Putschke and R. Neumann should be thanked for their personal efforts.

I would like to thank the Nederlandse Organisatie voor Zuiver Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek for the financing of this issue of the ALE.

Academies of Sciences and Universities in every European country should be acknowledged for their support given to all ALE National Committees. The patronage of the U.A.I. should once again be acknowledged with thanks.

I once again thank the institutions which have appointed scientific personnel for the ALE research: the Soviet Akademija Nauk SSSR (Academy of Sciences of the USSR), the French Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, the Spanish Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, Departamento de Geografía Lingüística, the West German Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, the Swedish Humanistik-Samhälls Vetenskapliga Forskningsrådet (Swedish Council for Research in the Humanities), the Austrian Kommission für Mundartkunde und Namenforschung, the Dutch Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, the Finnish Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus (Research Center for Finland's Domestic Languages), the Scandinavian Nordisk Kulturfond, the Finnish Valtion humanistinen toimikunta (State's Commission for Humanistic Sciences).

For their support given to the work of the ALE language departments we should thank the French CNRS and the University of Grenoble (Romance Department); the Universities of Nijmegen and of Groningen (Germanic Department); the Soviet Academy of Sciences (Balto-Slavic; Uralic; Other languages of the East); the Finnish Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus (Research Center for Finland's Domestic Languages) and Valtion humanistinen toimikunta (State's Commission for Humanistic Sciences) (Uralic Department); the University of Brest (Celtic Department); the University of Toulouse (Other languages of the West).

Our thanks should go to the institutions which have given the ALE financial support for the organization of Editorial meetings and for colloquia: i.e. the French CNRS and the University of Grenoble for the Colloquium at Grenoble-Aussois (1984), the Serbo-Croatian Academy of Sciences for the meeting of the Editorial Board at Belgrade (1985). It would be impossible to thank all the Institutions that have contributed to the realization of the Departments meetings.

My thanks to all ALE Editors, and in particular to those on whom I have often leaned for support: Terho Itkonen, Pavle Ivić, Gaston Tuaillon, Werner Winter.

I would like to thank Drs. Joep Kruijsen for his "double" work: as a Coordinating Secretary for the ALE and as a Secretary of the Germanic Department. His role in the organization of the *stage* for Department Secretaries should also be acknowledged.

My warmest, personal thanks go to Drs. Nicoline van der Sijs, who has been Editorial Secretary of the ALE and the President's main assistant in the last two years. She, more than anyone else, has contributed to the alleviation of the enormous burden of the ALE Presidency.

I would also like to thank Ms. Celeste Augusto for her spontaneous offer to help us in the critical period of proof-reading.

Drs. R.Th. Otten should be thanked for his valuable remarks and additions to the Arabic materials of the ALE.

Last but not least, I would like to thank Mr. D. Bakkes, of the Van Gorcum Publishing Division, for his personal efforts in meeting our "final" deadline.

Needles to say, in a project like the ALE a great number of people contribute, in different ways, to the interpretation of the materials that form the basis for the authors' contributions: in the first place, all the people who form the National Committees and whose names are listed in the first pages of the two volumes forming each issue. In Aussois and, more precisely, in Pécs, the ALE Editorial Board decided that the people who have contributed most to the so-called Departmental syntheses, i.e. to the interpretation of the materials for a single question at the level of a language group, should be mentioned separately in the *Introduction* to each issue. Before fulfilling this task, however, it is necessary to inform the reader: (i) that the President and Secretary of each Department are by definition involved, in different moments and at different levels, in departmental syntheses; therefore, omission of their names in this section does not mean that they have contributed less than others; (ii) that different working procedures for each Department may create different situations; (iii) that people mentioned in this section have played a more structural role in the realization of this issue than those mentioned by the authors in their commentaries; (iv) that it would be impossible to mention all the people who participated in the Departments' meetings and discussions, in the course of the last years, and who have in this way contributed to the departmental syntheses.

For the departmental syntheses of the questions treated in this issue, the following people should be acknowledged and thanked (in alphabetical order of Departments):

Balto-Slavic Department: V.V. Ivanov, P. Ivić, M. Szymczak, N. Z. Donadze, A. Ja. Blinkena, A. A. Krivickij, K. F. Morkunas, A. M. Zales'kyj.

Germanic Department: Nils Århammar, Joep Kruijsen; Arnold Dalen ("poire", "genévrier"), Ingeborg Hoff ("poire", "genévrier"), Marion Lompa ("branche"); Ellen Mooijman (all questions, either alone ("chandelle de glace", "fleur", "bouleau", "peuplier") or with the above-mentioned people).

Romance Department: G. Tuaillon ("bouleau", "peuplier", "belette"), H. Franconie ("fleur", "branche", "poire"). Ms. H. Franconie should be mentioned separately for her preparation of the European synthesis for "poire".

Uralic Department: Terho Itkonen, Leena Sarvas, Merja Sorsakivi.

Finally, I cannot omit mentioning a few people who have devoted an enormous amount of time and energy in helping me edit the various versions of the contributions of the present issue: Terho Itkonen, Gaston Tuaillon, Nils Århammar.

XV. I would like to conclude by expressing the wish that the ALE will continue to strive for the improvement of its quality, in the conviction that only in this way the ALE will also be able to carry on the spirit of the UNESCO constitution, as expressed by its 1st article: "to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture". In the noble context of the UNESCO constitution, "science" and "culture" acquire the highest possible meaning.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE SPÉCIFIQUE*

Alinei, Mario (1979), The Structure of Meaning, in: *A Semiotic Landscape. Proceedings of the First Congress of the International Association for Semiotic Studies* (Milan, June 1974), Berlin, pp. 499-503.

Alinei, Mario (1980), The Structure of Meaning Revisited, in: *Quaderni di Semantica I*, pp. 289-305.

Räsänen, Alpo (1985), Euroopan kielikartaston ensimmäinen vihko ilmestynyt, in: *Sananjalka* 27, pp. 189-194.

Semčyns'kyj, S. (1985), review, in: *Movoznavstvo*, pp. 75-78.

Topolińska, Z. (1985), review, in: *Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik*, LII, pp. 373-377.

ABRÉVIATIONS

1. Abréviations des noms des groupes de langues telles qu'on les trouve dans la carte de fond et dans les répertoires classifiés des formes.

		(en anglais)	(en allemand)
Ab	abkhazo-adyghé	Abkhazo-Adyge	abchasisch-adygeisch
Al	albanais	Albanian	albanisch
Ar	arabe	Arabic	arabisch
Ba	basque	Basque	baskisch
Blt	baltique	Baltic	baltisch
C	celtique	Celtic	keltisch
F	finnique	Finnic	ostseefinnisch
G	germanique	Germanic	germanisch
Gr	grec	Greek	griechisch
I	iranien	Iranian	iranisch
L	lapon	Lapp	lappisch
M	mongol	Mongolian	mongolisch
N	nakho-daghestanien	Nakho-Dagestanian	nacho-daghestanisch
P	permien	Permic	permisch
R	roman	Romance	romanisch
S	slave	Slavic	slavisch
Sa	samoyède	Samoyedic	samojedisch
T	ture	Turkic	Türksprachen
Tz	tzigane	Romany	Zigeunersprachen
U	ougrien	Ugric	ugrisch
V	volgaïen	Volgaic	wolgaisch

* Voir aussi la bibliographie générale, p. 225.